

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/647,059	08/22/2003	Mark H. Crane	0717.2037-001	9713	
21005	7590 03/07/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
HAMILTON	I, BROOK, SMITH &	PIZIALI, JI	PIZIALI, JEFFREY J		
530 VIRGINI P.O. BOX 913			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	MA 01742-9133		2673		

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	<del></del>				
Office Action Summary		10/647,059	CRANE ET AL.					
		Examiner	Art Unit					
		Jeff Piziali	2673					
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAIL Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communical period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory terestory within the set or extended period for reply will, by the ply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF THIS COMMU CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, ma tion. y period will apply and will expire SIX (6) it by statute, cause the application to becom	INICATION. y a reply be timely filed  MONTHS from the mailing date of this comme e ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	·				
Status	_							
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed or	n 22 August 2003.						
	_	This action is non-final.		•				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims							
4)🖾	☑ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠	Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.							
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)□	)☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Applicati	on Papers			•				
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.								
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>06 February 2004</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.								
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority u	inder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) 🗍 .	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for f	oreian priority under 35 U.S.C	C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f)					
a) All b) Some * c) None of:								
,-	1. Certified copies of the priority doc	uments have been received.		•				
	2. Certified copies of the priority doc		n Application No.					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the		· · · — —	age				
	application from the International I			J				
* S	ee the attached detailed Office action for	a list of the certified copies r	not received.					
Attachment	t(s)			•				
1) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Intervie	ew Summary (PTO-413)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date								
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO r No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/6/04</u> .	/SB/08) 5) ☐ Notice 6) ☐ Other:		<b>5</b> 2)				
S Patent and Tr			<del></del>					

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### **Drawings**

1. The drawings were received on 6 February 2004. These drawings are acceptable.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
   The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claims 5, 7, 10, 15, 17, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 4. The term "about optical infinity" in claims 5 and 15 is a relative term which renders the claims indefinite. The term "about optical infinity" is not defined by either claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art precisely how close to optical infinity the focus must be before constituting "about optical infinity."
- 5. The term "generally circular portion" in claims 7, 10, 17, and 20 is a relative term which renders the claims indefinite. The term "generally circular portion" is not defined by the claims, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of

Page 3

Art Unit: 2673

ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art precisely how near to circular a member portion must be before constituting "generally circular."

6. Claims 8 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, simply for being dependent upon rejected base claims.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 8. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ichikawa et al (US 5,266,930 A).

Regarding claim 1, Ichikawa discloses a headgear system comprising: headgear [Fig. 1; 5] with an upper headgear portion for being worn on a user's head and a lower headgear portion extending from the upper headgear portion for extending forwardly relative to a lower front portion of the user's head and below the user's eyes (see Fig. 1; Column 8, Lines 6-59); and a display assembly [Fig. 1; 11] mounted to the lower headgear portion for being located below at least one of the user's eyes so as not to obstruct the user's vision (see Column 8, Line 60 - Column 9, Line 9), the display assembly having a display that is visible when said at least one of the user's eyes looks downwardly (see Fig. 1), the display assembly being configured to be

Art Unit: 2673

adjustable by the user while the headgear system is worn by the user for changing the orientation of the display (see Column 9, Lines 10-58).

Regarding claim 2, Ichikawa discloses the headgear is a helmet [Fig. 1; 5], and the lower headgear portion is a face bar (see Fig. 1; Column 8, Lines 6-14).

Regarding claim 3, Ichikawa discloses the display assembly includes at least one rotatable joint [Fig. 2; 21] having frictional resistance so that the joint remains in a particular orientation until moved by the user (see Column 9, Lines 28-58).

Regarding claim 4, Ichikawa discloses the display is sized for viewing by one of the user's eyes when said one of the user's eyes looks downwardly (see Fig. 1; Column 8, Lines 6-14).

Regarding claim 5, Ichikawa discloses the display displays images which are focused at about optical infinity (see Fig. 1; Column 8, Lines 6-14).

Regarding claim 6, Ichikawa discloses the display assembly has a rotatable horizontal axis for allowing the display to be tilted upwardly and downwardly, and a rotatable vertical axis for allowing the display to be tilted side to side, relative to the user's head (see Figs. 2 & 3; Column 9, Lines 10-22).

Art Unit: 2673

Regarding claim 7, Ichikawa discloses the display assembly comprises: a base [Fig. 2; ... 16] for mounting to the face bar of the helmet, the base having a circular recess that is connected to an entrance slot (see Fig. 4); a rotatable member [Fig. 4; 19] having a generally circular portion that has a snap fit into the circular recess of the base through the entrance slot, the rotatable member being rotatable within the circular recess about the vertical axis; and two side members [Fig. 2; 17] extending from the rotatable member, the display being rotatably mounted between the side members along the horizontal axis (see Column 9, Lines 10-58).

Regarding claim 8, Ichikawa discloses the display assembly [Figs. 32 & 34; 737] is mounted to the face bar of the helmet for being below a first eye [Figs. 32 & 34; E<sub>R</sub>] of the user, the headgear system further comprising a second base [Figs. 32 & 34; 738] mounted to the face bar of the helmet for being below a second eye [Figs. 32 & 34; E<sub>L</sub>] of the user to allow the user to select the position of at least one display by snap fitting an associated rotatable member into the desired base (see Column 8, Lines 3-14 & 40-61; as well as Column 19, Lines 9-17).

Regarding claim 9, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in rejecting claims 1 and 6.

Regarding claim 10, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in rejecting claim 7.

Regarding claim 11, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in rejecting claim 1.

Art Unit: 2673

Regarding claim 12, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in rejecting claim 2.

Regarding claim 13, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in rejecting claim 3.

Regarding claim 14, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in rejecting claim 4.

Regarding claim 15, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in rejecting claim 5.

Regarding claim 16, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in rejecting claim 6.

Regarding claim 17, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in rejecting claim 7.

Regarding claim 18, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in rejecting claim 8.

Regarding claim 19, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in rejecting claims 1 and 6.

Regarding claim 20, this claim is rejected by the reasoning applied in rejecting claim 7.

Application/Control Number: 10/647,059

Art Unit: 2673

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicants'

disclosure. Massof et al (US 6,529,331 B2), Beautz (US 6,487,786 B2), Chen et al (US

6,462,882 B2), Amafuji et al (US 6,359,602 B1), Robertson et al (US 6,034,653 A), Shih et al

(US 5,856,811 A), Banbury (US 5,646,783 A), Kelly (US 5,406,415 A), and Hori et al (US

5,072,209 A) are cited to further evidence the state of the art pertaining to headgear systems.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Jeff Piziali whose telephone number is (571) 272-7678. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (6:30AM - 3PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on (571) 272-7681. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

2 March 2006

BIPIN SHALWALA SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Page 7

**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**